

GEORGE P. NEWCOMB

IBLA 83-339

Decided May 23, 1983

Appeal from decision of California State Office, Bureau of Land Management, declaring unpatented mining claims abandoned and void. CA MC 51124 and CA MC 51125.

Affirmed.

1. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Affidavit of Assessment Work or Notice of Intention to Hold Mining Claim -- Mining Claims: Recordation

Under sec. 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), the owner of a mining claim located on or before Oct. 21, 1976, must file a notice of intention to hold or evidence of performance of annual assessment work on the claim on or before Oct. 22, 1979, and prior to Dec. 31 of each year thereafter. This requirement is mandatory and failure to comply is deemed conclusively to constitute an abandonment of the claim by the owner and renders the claim void.

2. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Mining Claims and Abandonment -- Mining Claims: Abandonment

The conclusive presumption of abandonment which attends the failure to file an instrument required by 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976) is imposed by the statute itself. A matter of law, it is self-operative and does not depend upon any act or decision of an administrative official. In enacting the statute, Congress did not invest the Secretary with authority to waive or excuse noncompliance with the statute, or to afford claimants any relief from the statutory consequences.

3. Administrative Procedure: Adjudication -- Evidence: Generally -- Evidence: Presumptions -- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Affidavit of Assessment Work or Notice of Intention to Hold Mining Claim -- Mining Claims: Abandonment

Although at common law, abandonment of a mining claim can be established only by evidence demonstrating that it was the claimant's intention to abandon it and that he in fact did so, in enacting the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), Congress specifically placed the burden on the claimant to show, by his compliance with the Act's requirements, that the claim has not been abandoned and any failure of compliance produces a conclusive presumption of abandonment. Accordingly, extraneous evidence that a claimant intended not to abandon his claim may not be considered in such cases.

APPEARANCES: George P. Newcomb, pro se.

OPINION BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE HENRIQUES

George P. Newcomb appeals the California State Office, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), decision of January 17, 1983, which declared the unpatented Calico and Flowers lode mining claims, CA MC 51124 and CA MC 51125, abandoned and void because no proof of labor or notice of intention to hold the claims was filed with BLM prior to December 31, 1981, as required by section 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976). The 1981 proof of labor was submitted to BLM February 9, 1982.

Appellant states that he was criminally assaulted and robbed October 15, 1981, so that he was unable to perform the necessary recordation of his proof of labor with BLM prior to December 31, 1981. When he recovered, he did deliver the 1981 proof of labor to BLM February 9, 1982. His 1982 proof of labor was filed with BLM November 1, 1982, well before the deadline.

The proof of labor filed with BLM February 9, 1982, shows that it was recorded in Mariposa County, California, on November 30, 1981.

[1] Under section 314(a) of FLPMA, the owner of a mining claim located on or before October 21, 1976, must file notice of intention to hold the

claim or evidence of the performance of annual assessment work on the claim in the proper BLM office on or before December 30 of every calendar year following the date of recording the claims with BLM. This requirement is mandatory, not discretionary, and failure to comply is conclusively deemed to constitute abandonment of the claim by the owner and renders the claim void. Lynn Keith, 53 IBLA 192, 88 I.D. 369 (1981); James V. Brady, 51 IBLA 361 (1980).

[2, 3] The Board responded to arguments similar to those presented here in Lynn Keith, *supra*. With respect to the conclusive presumption of abandonment and appellants' argument that the intent not to abandon was manifest, we stated:

The conclusive presumption of abandonment which attends the failure to file an instrument required by 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976) is imposed by the statute itself, and would operate even without the regulations. See Northwest Citizens for Wilderness Mining Co, Inc. v. Bureau of Land Management, Civ. No. 78-46 M (D. Mont. June 19, 1979). A matter of law, the conclusive presumption is self-operative and does not depend upon any act or decision of an administrative official. In enacting the statute, Congress did not invest the Secretary of the Interior with authority to waive or excuse noncompliance with the statute, or to afford claimants any relief from the statutory consequences. Thomas F. Byron, 52 IBLA 49 (1981).

* * * Appellant also argues that the intention not to abandon these claims was apparent * * *. At common law, evidence of the abandonment of a mining claim would have to establish that it was the claimant's intention to abandon and that he in fact did so. Farrell v. Lockhart, 210 U.S. 142 (1908); 1 Am. Jur. 2d, Abandoned Property, §§ 13, 16 (1962). Almost any evidence tending to show to the contrary would be admissible. Here, however, in enacted legislation, the Congress has specifically placed the burden on the claimant to show that the claim has not been abandoned by complying with the requirements of the Act, and any failure of compliance produces a conclusive presumption of abandonment. Accordingly, extraneous evidence that a claimant intended not to abandon may not be considered. [Emphasis in original.]

53 IBLA at 196-97, 88 I.D. at 371-72.

The responsibility for complying with the recordation requirements rested with appellant. This Board has no authority to waive or excuse failure to comply with the statutory requirements, no matter how valid the reason. Lynn Keith, *supra*.

Appellant may wish to consult with BLM about the possibility of relocating these claims.

Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, the decision appealed from is affirmed.

Douglas E. Henriques
Administrative Judge

We concur:

Edward W. Stuebing
Administrative Judge

R. W. Mullen
Administrative Judge

